

THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY



3 1151 02745 1495



CAGE  
HT 851  
A65

# ANTI-SLAVERY MONTHLY REPORTER.

No. 45.]

FOR FEBRUARY, 1829. [No. 21. Vol. ii.

- 1.—PROCEEDINGS OF THE INCORPORATED SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.
- 2.—THE WEST INDIA COMMITTEE AND ITS MERCENARIES OF THE PRESS; MR. FRANKLIN, &c.
- 3.—COLONIAL STATISTICS, VIZ. ANTIGUA; MAURITIUS, (FRESH PROOFS OF HORRORS THERE); MONTSERRAT; AND ST. LUCIA.
- 4.—CONDUCT OF THE ASSEMBLY OF JAMAICA.

## I.—PROCEEDINGS OF THE PROPAGATION SOCIETY.

It is well known to our readers, that the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts is possessed of a considerable number of slaves, in the Island of Barbadoes, bequeathed to it upwards of a century ago, from whose labour it has drawn large sums of money, but for whose spiritual interests little until recently has been seriously attempted by it.

A sermon, on account of this Society, has been annually preached, since the beginning of the eighteenth century, generally by a Bishop or Dignitary of the Church. To some of these sermons we have had access; and, considering the discussions which have lately taken place, in reference to this and other Societies professedly engaged in the work of evangelizing the Slave population in our Colonies, a few extracts from them may not be ill-timed.\*

The annual sermon, in 1711, was preached by Bishop Fleetwood. In the course of it he takes occasion to advert to the case of those planters who will not permit their slaves to be instructed in the Christian faith, "a thing so common abroad, that I doubt whether there be any exception of any people of ours." He then proceeds to ask,—

"What can these people think of Christ? That He who came from heaven, to purchase to himself a church with his own precious blood, should sit contented and behold with unconcern those who profess themselves his servants, excluding from its gates those who would gladly enter if they might, and exercising no less cruelty to their souls than to their bodies! One may ask, indeed, with indignation, what such people think of Christ?" It would be as hard for them to tell this, as "to give an account of what they think of those unhappy creatures whom they use thus cruelly. They see them equally the workmanship of God with themselves; endued with the same faculties, and intellectual powers; bodies of the same flesh and blood; and souls as certainly immortal. These people" "were bought with the same price; purchased with the same blood of Christ, their common Saviour and Redeemer;—and, in order to all this, they were to have the means of salvation put into their hands; they were to be in-

\* Various other extracts of similar import may be seen in the Christian Observer for February 1828, p. 128.

structed in the faith of Christ." "Let any of these cruel masters tell us, what part of all these blessings were *not intended* for their unhappy Slaves by God, purchased for them by the blood of Christ, and which they are not equally capable of enjoying with themselves?—What account, then, will these masters give of *themselves*, who?" "will not permit their slaves to be instructed, and become the servants of their heavenly Master; who bring them, as it were, into sight of the waters of Life, and then withhold them from receiving any benefit from them? They hope, it is likely, God will be merciful to these unhappy creatures, though *they* will not be so; but they have reason to fear God may deny that mercy to themselves, which they deny to others; and no man living can assign a better and more justifiable cause, for God's withholding mercy from a Christian, than *that* Christian's withholding the mercy of Christianity from an unbeliever." "For this inhuman practice, there are but two or three poor pretences." "To the first of these, namely, that should they suffer their slaves to be baptized, they would immediately become free, we may answer, that were this true, the mischief of it would be no greater in our Plantations abroad than it is at home, where there is no such thing as slavery, but all our work is done by hired servants;—for good wages and good usage will always invite servants, even to the hardest labours. And if this would not turn to a good account, it were better the world should pay much dearer for the pleasures and conveniences those places afford, than purchase them so cheaply at the expence of so much misery, such cruelty and hard treatment of men as good as ourselves, and at the hazard of their souls. But allowing that this would be some inconvenience to the Government, with respect to trade, is there any question whether the blessing of God upon their piety and good designs, in furtherance of his glory in the salvation of men's souls, would make an ample compensation for all the inconveniences and loss it might sustain, by making their slaves, or letting them be made, Christians? But after all, what considering man would run the hazard of being under God's displeasure, by hindering others from becoming Christians for all the profit, honour, and advantage in the world?" "One may wonder how a Christian Government can look upon itself as unconcerned in this affair, and only consider these unhappy wretches as creatures which save the kingdom the charge of transporting horses and beasts of carriage for the islands' service, without reflecting on their shape and form and intellectual powers, and without looking up to Christ their common Master, the Saviour and Redeemer of us all.

"This unconcernedness of the public it is, most probably, that encourages a great many private people, at home among ourselves, to keep these Africans in their native ignorance and blindness, and to continue them infidels in the midst of a Christian kingdom. These people ought to think what answer they will make to Christ, when He shall ask them, why they would not help to increase His kingdom, and to make their fellow creatures as happy as they hoped themselves to be by being *called by his name*? Such questions will be asked them, with severity enough, and will require a better answer than, I fear, the subtillest Christian in the world can make; and, therefore, sure, it were better to prevent them by removing the occasion."

Let those who have conducted the Society's affairs during a century of neglect answer these questions.

Again, in 1714, the celebrated Dean Stanhope thus addressed the assembled Society: he is speaking of the negroes:

"Slaves, it is true they are, wild and untaught, exposed to common sale, and wrought like beasts of burden." "Is it nothing to you that they are created by the same God, formed of the same flesh and blood, descended from the same common ancestor, endued with the same souls, the same capacities of immortal happiness; nay, which should touch us more tenderly than all the rest, that they also are redeemed by the same precious ransom? Birth and fortune, climate and complexion, barbarism and servitude, are only circumstantial differences, such as ought not to be made too great reckoning of, when the essential parts continue the same. A good man will find but too much ground for grief and pity, but none at all for neglect, contempt, or inhuman treatment, even in the meanest and most abject of his own species." "He will lament the uncontrolled usurpa-

tion and tyranny of the Prince of darkness; and be zealous in making reprisals for that God, whose kinder providence hath not left *him* in the same forlorn condition. And this is the true light to view these creatures in; that they, *by whom you subsist*, may not be suffered to perish; nor your salvation be hazarded, by obstructing, or not promoting theirs, for whom the Son of God did not disdain to shed his blood."

"With respect to the Slaves," said Dean, afterwards Bishop, Berkeley, preaching before the Society in 1731, "our reformed Planters might learn from those of the Church of Rome, how it is their duty and interest to behave. Both French and Spaniards have intermarried with Indians, to the great strength, security, and increase of their colonies. They take care to instruct both them and their negroes, in the Popish religion, to the reproach of those who profess a better. They have also Bishops, and seminaries for clergy; and it is not found that their colonies are worse subjects, or depend less on their mother country on that account."

In a sermon preached, by Bishop Claggett, before the Society in 1736, occurs the following passage:

"Nor has God put the poor negroes into our power for no other end but that we might use them ill, as Pharaoh did the children of Israel, when under a pretence that he might be better served by them himself, he would not suffer them to serve at all the Lord of heaven and earth who made both him and them. But the cause of the negroes hath been so well pleaded by others, who have spoken before me on this occasion,\* that I do not think myself capable of adding any thing on that head."

Our next quotation shall be from a sermon of Bishop, afterwards Archbishop, Secker, preached before this Society in 1740.

"The next objects of the Society's concern were the poor negroes. Their servitude is most laborious, their punishments most severe. And thus many thousands of them spend their whole days, one generation after another, undergoing with reluctant minds continual toil in this world, and comforted with no hopes of reward in a better. For it is not to be expected that masters, too commonly negligent of Christianity themselves, will take much pains to teach it to their slaves, whom even the better part of them are in a great measure habituated to consider, as they do their cattle, merely with a view to the profit arising from them. Not a few, therefore, have openly opposed their instruction, from an imagination that baptism would entitle them to freedom. Others, by obliging them to work on Sundays to provide themselves necessaries, leave them neither time to learn religion in, nor any prospect of being able to subsist if once the duty of resting on that day becomes part of their belief. And some, it may be feared, have been averse to their becoming Christians, because, after that, no pretence will remain for not treating them like men."

"If," said Bishop Drummond, in his sermon before the Society, in 1754, "If there are those, who studiously hinder their slaves from becoming Christians, or who refuse them the means, or opportunity, or encouragement to be instructed; we cannot attribute this hard usage to any other principle than avarice, inhumanity, or irreligion."

The following important passage we extract from a sermon, by Bishop Green, preached before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in 1768.

"A great consumption of human stock is acknowledged to be made by our colonies. How far this may be owing to the hardness of their fare, or the severity of their task-masters, or the rigour of their service, it may be difficult to know; but the Sabbath, which to other mortals is a respite from labour, is to them, it seems, no day either of rest or of improvement. And will not he who is Lord of the Sabbath look with displeasure on such of his disciples as pay no

---

\* How is it that of late years we have had so few such pleadings?

regard to his wise and holy institution? But Providence has given us a favourable opportunity of correcting many of the casualties and abuses which we often hear complained of, and correcting them by one of the most natural and efficacious means,—by our own example, by our proper management of a plantation left to carry on the liberal and benevolent views of this society, in the advancement of religion and learning. As men, it will become us to soften the miseries and hardships of that servitude in which these poor Africans are placed, to treat them with all the lenity which such a state will admit; and though we profit by their labour, not to impose on them such hard and rigorous tasks as are injurious to health and incompatible with any degree of self-enjoyment. As Christians, it will behave us to allow such means of religious instruction as are suited to the unimproved state of their understandings, and to recommend that instruction by the incitement of a good example; to explain to them, on every proper occasion, the saving truths of the Gospel; to encourage their patient continuance in well doing, by the gracious assistances it promises, and the assurances it affords; to animate their hopes, under the hardships they suffer, with the prospect—not indeed of returning, as they imagine, to their own, but of being removed to that better country, where it is said, “They who came out of great tribulation shall serve God day and night in his temple, shall neither hunger nor thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them; but the Lamb shall feed them and lead them to fountains of living water.”

In a sermon preached before the Society by Bishop, afterwards Archbishop Moore, in 1782, we find the following passage:

“We make it our endeavour” (How greatly deceived, as to the fact was the good Archbishop!) “to mitigate the severities and hardships of a slavery, shocking to every humane and considerate mind, and really degrading to our common nature. By imparting to the African slaves the comfortable truths of the Gospel, we teach them patience to endure their hard lot, and raise their expectations to the future glorious liberty of the sons of God. At the same time we restrain, as far as in us lies, all inhumanity in their masters, by reminding them, that they also have a Master in heaven. We inculcate on them, from the most awful motives, the indispensable duty and obligation of allowing their wretched fellow-creatures leisure and opportunities for religious instruction, and particularly of respecting them from labour on the Christian day of rest.”

In a subsequent sermon, however, preached by the late Bishop Porteus, in 1783, it appears that nothing effectual had even then been done, after about eighty years of possession, to civilize and christianize the wretched bondsmen of the Society. His proposals to that effect are all future and prospective, and from the evidence given on the subject, by the Society's agents in 1789, before the Privy Council,\* and record-

---

\* The following are the main points in the evidence of Mr. Brathwaite, the Society's agent, and Member of Council in Barbadoes, given before the Privy Council:

Being asked, what time is set apart for the slaves *to labour for themselves*; he answers, “Sundays are always allowed them for that purpose.”—He is again asked, whether, on the estates of the Society, there is any difference in its circumstances or regulations, or in the management and treatment of its slaves, as compared with other estates? To this he gives no very direct answer, but he says nothing that indicates any material difference in these respects. He is further asked, what is the practice respecting the marriage of slaves, and the regulations respecting it? His reply is, “*I do not know*” (Remember he was the Society's agent, and yet he says, *I do not know*) “that there is any religious ceremony on the marriage of negro slaves in Barbadoes. There is no law respecting it. They (the slaves) have often more than one wife.” “They suffer much from promiscuous concubinage.”

Mr. Brathwaite then produces a letter, addressed to himself, respecting the Society's estate, by some person who appears to have been a clergyman, in which are the following expressions: “It is notorious that polygamy is universally

ed in the Report then drawn up and laid in the following year on the table of Parliament, we learn, on the very best authority, that the Society's slaves were still in a state of absolute heathenism, without

practised among them;" and what the writer proposes to be done on this point is, to tell the slaves that polygamy, though tolerated, was not approved; but that "in fact, the women they called their wives were only their concubines, and that a Christian could have but *one wife at a time*, to whom he was bound to be faithful; and that I hoped, in time, to see them act accordingly, from their own conviction of the propriety and advantage of it; and that till then I could not consecrate the union, formed between any negro man and woman, by the marriage rites in practice among the white people, but must leave them to the inconveniences and infidelities of such a marriage state as theirs, depending on the temporary caprice, partiality, and prejudices of the parties. Yet I would remark to them, that I should insist on their not increasing the number of their nominal wives, by taking others, after baptism and religious instruction, for then their sin of ignorance would become a sin of wilful perverseness; and, in like manner, that the rising generation, baptized in their infancy, must be content with *one wife*, joined to them upon Christian principles." It does not appear that even this miserable, inadequate, and futile project was ever acted upon.

In addition to this feeble proposition of a remedy for polygamy, the same person enters into an apologetical vindication of the practice by which the slaves were employed, on Sunday, in labouring for themselves, and in this way, he says, "increasing their own and their families' domestic comforts in an honest way." He adds, that Mr. Brathwaite, to whom he is writing, knows as well as he, "that the nature of our properties here" (meaning, of course, slave cultured estates) "will not admit of so large a portion of their time being taken up in teaching them (the slaves) to read, and advancing them from the rudiments of language to an adequate knowledge of it." And then, after some equally absurd and abortive suggestions respecting religious worship and instruction, he says "could you do this, I suppose you will have promoted the cause of Christianity in the most extensive manner possible."—And as for the "multitude of unlettered souls, unavoidably destined to hard labour and servitude" (meaning, of course, the slaves) "that you will have made them easier under their yoke, and, in fact, have rendered it *more tolerable*."

Mr. Brathwaite, having given the above letter in evidence, is afterwards asked his opinion of the causes which impede the natural increase of the negroes. The causes he assigns are, "promiscuous concubinage," and "occasional working the negroes too hard."—He is further asked, whether the slaves or their children are baptized? He answers, that he believes they are not in general baptized, but that baptism is never refused. He adds, "I do not know that any missionaries have been sent *hence*" (from England) "to the island of Barbadoes, except a catechist employed on the Society's estate, for the instruction of the negroes on it, in addition to the parochial clergyman. The catechist has, as far as I am informed, had but little success in improving the moral principles of the negroes, though they have, I believe, been baptized."—"As far as I am informed?" "I believe!" And yet this witness was the Society's agent!

Mr. Parry, many years Governor of Barbadoes, states, in his evidence, that in King William's reign, General Codrington had bequeathed his large property in this island to the Society, one of his motives being "the instruction of his negroes in the Christian faith." "The Society negroes, as long as the college was kept up, were baptized; and there is still a clergyman who is employed as catechist," (probably the writer of the letter to Mr. Brathwaite,) "but the negroes on this plantation *are neither better nor worse, in any one respect, than their fellows on the neighbouring estates.*"

Mr. Steele gives similar evidence. He observes, that "it had been a *vulgar opinion*, that the fine estate annexed to Codrington College had been committed to that venerable body (the Society) for some religious or good purpose," but there do not now appear, he says, to be any religious institutions for the benefit of the slaves in Barbadoes, nor any missionaries from England, unless the only catechist on the estate was so to be considered. He adds, in very remarkable phrase, "Before any kind of religious or moral education can, to any effectual

marriage, practising polygamy, and suffering . . . no material respect from the state of awful depression and brutal ignorance, and cruel coercion of the other slaves around them.—Bishop Porteus, in 1783, employed his eloquence in urging the Society then to form, and digest, and arrange measures, with a view to the great object of christianizing the slaves; and, though the time for doing all which he proposed, might, he feared, “be at some distance,” yet “*the first steps* towards it,” he conceived, “might certainly be taken without delay.” “We may, at least, *inquire* more exactly into the effects produced by the labours of our catechist on our own negroes;” (the return to which inquiry, six years after, on the part of Mr. Brathwaite, the Society’s agent, was still;) “we may send *him* fresh instructions;” “from these *beginnings*, we may advance,” “till our plantation become a model for all the West Indian islands to imitate.”—The pious Bishop then drew a striking picture of what might be effected among the slaves by means of the Society’s “care to make their yoke easy and their burden light, to civilize their manners, to enlarge their understandings, to reform their hearts, and to open to them a prospect in a better and a happier country.”

“And let us not be debarred,” he proceeded, “from this noble undertaking, by the apprehensions of that additional expense in which it may involve us.” “Should it even require more than our resources can supply, we need be under no apprehension of wanting proper support when once it is known that the civilization and conversion of the negro slaves is to be hereafter one of the grand leading objects of your pious labours.” “Every hand will be open on the occasion; and there cannot be a doubt, but that the increase of our benefactions and subscriptions will soon gratify our most sanguine wishes. It is impossible that the generosity, the humanity, I will add, the justice of the English nation can suffer *near half a million* of their fellow-creatures to continue in the most deplorable state of heathenism, irreligion, and vice, without giving the Society every assistance that may be necessary to extricate them out of it. It would be glorious to Great Britain to take the lead in this benevolent and truly Christian enterprise. And allow me to add, that it is peculiarly incumbent on the people of this kingdom to exert their utmost liberality in alleviating the miseries, both temporal and spiritual, of the wretched Africans, since they have been, for many years, more largely concerned in that inhuman merchandize of men, and have imported more slaves into the colonies, than any other nation in Europe. By their means principally have many thousands, many millions, of human creatures been torn from their native land, from every blessing that was valuable, every connexion that was dear to them; and, after passing in their voyage through incredible hardships and difficulties, (under which great numbers of them actually perish,) have been landed in a country and among a people unknown to them; and without offence or fault of theirs, have been doomed to a perpetual servitude, a servitude too which they leave (the only inheritance they have to leave) entailed on their latest posterity. Surely it deserves consideration again and again, whether this cruel havock of human life among the slaves might not be prevented, without any injury to the islands.”

“Let then our countrymen make haste to relieve, as far as they are able, the calamities they have brought on so large a part of the human race; let them endeavour to wipe away the reproach of having delivered over so many of their innocent fellow-creatures to a most heavy temporal bondage, both by contributing to sooth and alleviate that as much as possible, and by endeavouring to rescue them from the still more cruel bondage of ignorance and sin.”

---

good end, be offered to the negroes, those immoral and impolitic laws of this colony, which give a legal cover and encouragement to the most atrocious crimes that white people may commit, must be abrogated.”



These striking admonitions of this excellent Prelate were unheeded by the nation and its government. Nay, they were unheeded by the Society itself, though again earnestly pressed on its attention by Bishop Warner in 1787, by Bishop Bagot in 1792, by Bishop Prettyman in 1795, and by Bishop, afterwards Archbishop Manners Sutton, in 1797; as well as by many other preachers during the intermediate years; until, at length, in the year 1818, and not till then, those *first steps* were taken, those *beginnings* were made, and most feebly and inadequately made, which, thirty-two years earlier, Bishop Porteus had urged with so much eloquence and force, and which Bishop Fleetwood urged, no less forcibly, upwards of a century before that period.

Our last extract is from the sermon of Archbishop Manners Sutton, wherein he says,

“Christianity hath left all temporal governments as it found them, without impeachment of any form or description whatever, instilling only into the minds of the governors and governed the love of order, of justice, of mercy, of forgiveness, of mutual goodwill, of universal charity. If all or any of these be incompatible with slavery, doubtless slavery is incompatible with the Christian religion. But surely it will not be argued by those who have an interest in the continuance of the system, that the slave should be excluded from the light of the Gospel, and the hope of immortality, through the merits and mediation of our blessed Saviour, lest a knowledge of these high matters should tend, in its immediate consequences, to ease his yoke and to lighten his burden. If, however, there be any one hardy enough to advance the argument, I trust there will never be wanting virtue in this country to draw it to a short conclusion: it cannot be a question with Christians, whether the propagation of the Gospel or the system of slavery shall be preferred.”

We have said that the first semblance of any thing like *efficient* Christian instruction or discipline, introduced among the Society's slaves, was in the year 1818, after at least four or five generations of those slaves must have passed into eternity. It now remains to be seen what the Directors have done, since that time, to repair the incalculable evils of former neglect, and to raise their slaves from ignorance and vice, from oppression, degradation, and bondage, to civil freedom, and the still higher blessings of Christian liberty. Their last report seems to aim at repelling the attack made on their proceedings by the Rev. John Riland, in the *Christian Observer* for 1828, p. 50; but in fact it only confirms the truth of his complaint.—It is admitted, by the agent of the Society, that “no registry of punishments has ever been kept on the Society's estate.” No check, therefore, can have existed on that agent's arbitrary inflictions on the men, women, and children, intrusted to his superintendence. An advocate of the Society, (probably its Secretary,) had affirmed, in the most express terms, (thereby showing the ignorance at least which then prevailed as to the facts of the case) that labour was not “enforced” by “the whip,” that “corporal punishment was abolished on the estate,” that “no corporal punishment was allowed on the estate;” (*ergo* the whip was abolished) “nor had been for some years practised.” Nay, this gentleman actually stated (as may be seen in the *Christian Remembrancer* for January 1828,) “I do not for my own part believe, that except to drive cattle, a whip is ever employed upon the estate, either as excitement or punishment; for it is,” he adds, “expressly contrary to the rules laid down, to employ any corporal punishment!” But what is the statement of the resident

agent of the Society, in reply to an inquiry addressed to him on this subject, and recently published in the Society's Report? It is this, "I cannot say its use," (viz. that of the whip) "has been entirely abolished."—"The driver was compelled to take it up again for a short time."—"I trust the time is not very distant," (it is of course yet future) "when we shall find that the use of the *whip in the field*,"—(not of the whip, merely as an instrument of punishment for crimes, but of THE WHIP IN THE FIELD) "may be dispensed with altogether." Just so might the most thorough-going planter, (even a Mr. Huggins or a Mr. Hodge) as Mr. Riland well remarks, have expressed himself.\*

In the year 1829, therefore, it appears that the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has not yet afforded to its labourers the inducement of wages for tilling and reaping its fields, as recommended by Bishop Fleetwood, nearly one hundred and twenty years ago; but still avows, after such a length of possession, that "the use of *the whip in the field*" has not yet "been dispensed with!"

---

We had reached this point of our progress, when the kindness of a friend placed in our hands a condensed statement of the proceedings of the Society since 1818, issuing from the Society itself, and printed expressly for the satisfaction of all "who take an interest in the spiritual and temporal welfare of the negroes on the Codrington Plantations;" in other words, for its own vindication. This statement, while it calls for no alteration in what we have already written, but, on the contrary, serves to confirm it, will lead us considerably to enlarge our observations.

On perusing this important and interesting document, the first point which has fixed our attention is the medium through which alone the Society seems to obtain its information respecting the state and condition of its slaves. It is chiefly through the Rev. I. H. Pinder, the chaplain, and Mr. Forster Clarke, the attorney, or agricultural agent of the estates. We do not intend to say one word to derogate from the respectability of these gentlemen; but, unless we are greatly misinformed, Mr. Pinder is a native of Barbadoes, who has been familiarized to the sight and immediate contact of slavery from infancy, and who is himself a holder of slaves, either in possession or reversion; and Mr. Clarke has risen through all the different grades of plantership, from that of an overseer following with a cowskin the negro gang in the field; and then of a manager directing and coercing the labours of all the slaves on the estate, and arbitrarily administering its whole economical and punitive discipline; to that of an attorney or agricultural agent, with the power of appointing the manager and controlling his operations. Now we greatly question whether it is by the hands of men thus educated that the Society ought to act, or through the eyes of such men that it ought to see, or by the ideas of such men that its judgment ought to be regulated. On the contrary we are apprehensive, that while the Society relies on information derived from such sources, it cannot fail to be both the victim and unwitting instrument of

---

\* See Christian Observer for January 1829, p. 34.

much delusion. And we say this (without meaning in the very slightest degree to impeach the upright intentions of either gentleman,) from a knowledge of the unavoidable effects on their feelings and judgment of the circumstances in which its informants have been placed. To this fruitful source of error we shall have occasion hereafter to advert.\*

It is now frankly stated by the Society itself, that "the slaves on these estates were never provided with any regular system of religious teaching until the year 1818." p. 7. Let us look at the nature of this teaching, and at what the Society is actually doing for its slaves in the way of school instruction.—In the first place, such instruction is made, by an express regulation, to exclude "writing and arithmetic," p. 5. And why does it exclude them? Is it for any reason but the participation of the Society's agents in Barbadian prejudices, and the unwarrantable deference of the Society to those prejudices? Besides this the attendance of children at school is restricted to those who are under ten years of age. Till ten, but no longer, may they be taught reading for four hours in each day. In consequence of this unaccountable restriction we presume it is that the very highest form can read only in the New Testament or the Psalter; (p. 18 and 24,) and as children quit the reading school with only this degree of proficiency, we may conjecture of how little use such instruction must be to them in future life. But on what ground does the Society restrict instruction in letters to children under ten years, excluding all above that age, and even the adult population on its estates, from acquiring the capacity to read the word of God? The murdered missionary, Smith, contrived to teach many of the adult Slaves in his congregation at Demerara to read their Bibles, (Reporter, No: 41, p. 326.) The Missionary Wray, of Berbice, has been equally successful with the Crown slaves in that colony; and even in Barbadoes itself some of the adult slaves in Mr. Harte's congregation have contrived

\* Nothing can more strikingly shew the state of their minds than some of the instances they exhibit of the *liberality* of the Society's treatment. (See p. 9.)

1. Draughts of water are supplied to the slaves at work in the field! Can we imagine them at work, under a tropical sun, without access to this boasted boon of a draught of water! And yet the Creole agents well knew what an indulgence even a cup of cold water was. They had doubtless seen gangs toiling for many a burning hour without even one drop of water to cool their tongues.

2. *Severe* punishments are *rarely* inflicted! What West Indian ever admitted that *severity* was *often* exercised by him?

3. Mothers having three living children, have every Saturday afternoon allotted to them!—In the Society's Report of 1711—1713, we are told that an order had been sent out, "that the negroes should have liberty on *Saturdays* in the afternoon to work for themselves, that they may have time to attend instruction on the Lord's day." This order was probably never executed; but still what a retrogradation of purpose and intention does it indicate! In 1829, we have the Society lauding itself for permitting mothers having three living children, (ten or twelve individuals at most,) to enjoy the same indulgence which in ancient times was ordered to be given to *the negroes*, that is, the negroes generally.

4. *Every* mother having EIGHT CHILDREN ALIVE, has the undisputed enjoyment of Thursday!—that is, of one day in the week, to look after and care for *eight* children! Why, many West Indian codes exempt entirely from labour mothers having six! Besides, is there not a fallacy in the word *Every*? How many mothers, having *eight* children alive, are to be found on these estates? Is there *one*, or are there *two*?

to obtain, *from their own resources*, a knowledge of letters, (ib. p. 325). And yet, by a regulation which the Society for propagating the Gospel sanctions, nearly 300 Creole slaves born in Barbadoes, therefore native born subjects of the king, nurtured in the very domicile of the Society itself, are doomed to exclusion from all instruction in reading, because they have passed the age of *Ten*. Can the Society possibly continue to uphold so indefensible a regulation? We are told (p. 8,) that "the desire of the slaves for instruction is manifest." Why is that desire thus repressed by those who ought, nay, who are bound to satisfy it?

We are further told that it is one of the rules of the Society, adopted, it should seem, for the first time in 1818, "that marriage be encouraged among the slaves;" (p. 6,) and yet it is stated, (p. 8,) that "there is but ONE instance of marriage among them legally performed." Here, however, what we most of all admire is the elaborate apology of the Chaplain of the Society for the absence of the marriage tie among its slaves, and the Society's most unaccountable adoption of that apology. The Chaplain, indeed, tells us that he ardently looks forward to the influence of religion in "putting an end to polygamy, and in promoting a desire and suitable reverence for this hallowed band." Yet he argues that their present connexions are not to be regarded in the light of promiscuous concubinage; instances of fidelity ("connubial fidelity" he calls it by a strange misnomer) being to be met with, though in other cases it is too frequently violated. Again, at p. 19, the Society edifies the public with reprinting its Chaplain's farther apology for the prevailing polygamy and concubinage. Though there is no marriage, he says, the husband considers *those* he lives with as his wives. "National habits," he adds, "are not changed in a day."—(The day to the Society has been a long one—upwards of 120 years.) But "when Christian instruction has had longer time" (how much longer?) "to operate," then we may look forward with hope to the slaves marrying, and polygamy vanishing.—Can it be by a society comprehending all the Archbishops and Bishops of England that currency is given to such views as these? The defence seems quite as good in principle for concubinage in one part of the empire as in another, in England as in Barbadoes. Besides, the Chaplain mistakes the very nature of marriage. He forgets that it is a civil, as well as a religious institution, and that not only Christians, but heathens and infidels marry, and are bound by the laws affecting marriage. It is the *law* which prescribes what shall be its form, and its rights, and its obligations. But the Chaplain of the Society (and the Society seems to accredit his views by circulating them in this defence of its own conduct) seems to think, that the slaves should, at least, continue to live in concubinage and polygamy until his labours shall have made them Christians; making little or no account of the difference between an union sanctioned by *law*, and so legitimatizing its offspring, and such a casual union as no more binds the subjects of it to each other, than it binds the beasts of the stall. We are lost in amazement on reading such things.—When the Maroons of Jamaica were removed to Sierra Leone in the year 1800, they had lived in polygamy and concubinage like the slaves of this Society. They were given to understand that such modes of life were *unlawful*, and could no longer be tolerated; and

and they at once agreed in future to abandon them. Now what has the Society done to put an end to this flagrant evil in its own family, among its own servants, persons actually born in its own house? Would the Governors of this Society, our Archbishops and Bishops, permit their male and female domestics to cohabit together without the sanction of marriage, merely because they had been previously uninstructed, in the hope that in time their Lordships' chaplains might succeed in convincing them of the impropriety of the practice? We suspect too that this state of illicit cohabitation is made no bar to the admission of persons to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, there being on the estate only *one* marriage of slaves, and the number of communicants, "slave and free," being *seventeen* (p. 19); a number of communicants it must be allowed sufficiently small, at the end of more than 120 years, even if all of them were slaves.

At p. 7 it is implied that the want of funds prevented any regular means of religious instruction being provided for their slaves until 1818. Yet the Society had always been in the receipt and expenditure of considerable funds, a part derived from the labours of these very slaves. What stronger claim could exist on those funds, whether derived from that source or from public or private contributions, than was preferred by the spiritual destitution of the slaves themselves?

The most important portion of the Society's statement consists of a letter from Mr. Clarke, the agricultural agent, dated in May last, and evidently intended as a reply to the inquiries addressed, a few months before, to the Society, by Mr. Riland. The most material part, however, of Mr. Clarke's information is wholly omitted; we mean his "list of the slaves, and the employment of each, with their respective ages and colours." (p. 26, &c.)

Mr. Clarke's account of the general treatment of the slaves, as well as that of Mr. Pinder, (p. 9,) does not differ materially, from that which West Indian planters are in the habit of giving as to the general style of their treatment. We believe it, however, to be much more correct than *theirs* usually is; and its greater correctness is proved by the comparative increase of the slaves on these estates. The descriptions which come to us, from Demerara and Jamaica, are quite as favourable to the humanity of the proprietors as those of Mr. Clarke and Mr. Pinder; but the results would indicate that there was much more of truth in the latter. Mr. Clarke has not enabled us to ascertain the rate of *increase*; but it appears, as far as we can form an opinion, to be about  $1\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. per annum, while the amount of *decrease*, even on Lord Seaford's estates in Jamaica, is  $1\frac{1}{4}$  per cent.; in Demerara, upwards of 2 per cent.; and in Trinidad nearly 3 per cent. But still the rate of increase which appears to take place among the Society's bondsmen, falls much below that both of the slaves in the Bahamas and the United States, and of the free population in Jamaica and the other colonies. And some of the causes of this inferiority, notwithstanding any comparative mildness of treatment, are perfectly apparent.—To say nothing of the licentious habits of polygamists and concubinists, for one third of the year, it is admitted, (p. 26,) that the labour of the slaves is protracted from five in the morning till eight or nine o'clock at night;—and we may assume that Mr. Clarke gives us the least unfavourable

avourable view of his own exactions. But what must the effect be of such continuity of labour in such a climate, exacted too, be it remembered, under the compulsion of the whip or of confinement in the stocks?—Again, no registry of punishments is kept on the estate, though these punishments are generally inflicted, not by order even of Mr. Clarke, but at the will of the resident manager, Mr. Hinkson. Now that these punishments have been *few* and *light*, we must take on the bare assertion of men habituated, through life, to the whip and the stocks, and from whom we might probably form a very different estimate on the subject, if we had the record book before us. But surely the want of such a record is quite inexcusable, after the distinct enunciation of the wishes of Government on that subject in 1823. Mr. Clarke and the Society could not be ignorant that such a record was required, or that importance was attached to it by the Government, and by all who know any thing of West Indian discipline. And yet, after a lapse of five years, even this simple measure of reform, this slight check on the despotic power of the manager, has not been adopted either by the Society or its agent. We cannot, therefore, admit, on such authority as is now before us, that on the Society's estates punishments have been either *rare* or *light*. Rare or light they may be, as compared with many other sugar plantations; but that they are rare or light as compared with what occurs in any English village of 400 inhabitants, or in any village of free labourers within the British dominions, we must have some better evidence than the loose assurances of men who have breathed from infancy the very atmosphere of slavery, and who have been familiarized to the very manipulation of all its loathsome and disgusting, and heart-hardening accompaniments.

But the whip in the field! The driver and manager, who it seemed had been ordered to lay it aside, represented to Mr. Clarke, (and Mr. Clarke, good easy man, admitted their plea,) that the want of it was attended with great inconvenience, and with loss of labour. The human cattle had begun to move slowly and sluggishly, on the whip being removed from sight and hearing, and it was therefore resumed to quicken their movements. The *crimes* which required it, and we are told they are “the *common* offences of the field,” were “idleness, insolence, and insubordination.”—For these *CRIMES* the men and women living on the Society's estates, and toiling for the Society's benefit from day to day, and all day long, without wages, were punishable, and were punished, in the year 1828, by the whip, or by confinement “for one, two, or more days or weeks, according to the nature of the offence;” and all this at the sole pleasure of a Mr. Hinkson, who renders no account to the Society, because he keeps none, either of the lashes he inflicts, or of the hours and days of imprisonment he awards. And these punishments, be it remembered, are inflicted by his arbitrary mandate, not in general for any thing that *we* should call *crime*, or punish as such *here*, but for *idleness*, for *loitering*, for *saucy language*, and for what is called “*neglect of business*.”\*

---

\* The system of coercion extends beyond the mere work of the field. It is employed to enforce attendance at church on Sunday, (p. 7, and 13.) Those who do not attend church on Sunday are condemned to labour (*hard labour*

And is this to continue? Is the Society to go on exacting their uncompensated toil from these poor creatures by means of stocks and stripes? Are they not entitled at least to *wages*, if not to *liberty*, at the hands of this Christian corporation? They are fed, we shall be told, and clothed, and lodged. So are the horses of every Governor of the Society; but like those horses they are *driven* to their labour. They can remit it in no case at their own choice, even for an hour, without the hazard of bodily suffering. The base passion of fear, therefore, is the only spring of action which is called into exercise.

The power of self-enfranchisement, however, is a boon which the Society seems never to have thought of extending to its slaves.—About six years ago three of them redeemed themselves by purchase, and a father is now about to be allowed to buy the freedom of two of his daughters;—and the price of the redemption of these five poor creatures,—the long savings, doubtless, of many a painful fragment of time, rescued from the Society's constrained servitude—is unscrupulously extorted from them, to swell the general funds of the corporation. We should like to know its amount.—The remarks of Mr. Clarke, on this subject, (p. 28,) are in the true style of Creolian prejudice, but we need not enter upon them. As for the Society, it has evidently bestowed no serious consideration on the subject. It continues to grasp these human chattels, “the stock of the estate,” as the Society scruples not to call them, (p. 17,) as firmly as any planter in Barbadoes; and even the Christian children, born from year to year under its roof, continue doomed, as far as any thing has yet been done by it, to bear, in perpetuity, the brutalizing yoke of slavery, for the sole purpose of replenishing the Society's coffers.

Our view of the effects of the abolition of Sunday markets in Barbadoes, boasted of so highly by the Society for the Conversion of Slaves, (See Reporter, No. 41, p. 321, &c.) is incidentally, but most fully confirmed in this statement. The Chaplain says, (p. 24,) that he is confident, “the Society will be gratified to learn that its slaves will feel *no inconvenience* from the abolition of the Sunday market, as it affects the sale of their provisions. &c. as Mr. Clarke has determined to allow all the labouring slaves on the plantation every alternate Saturday, as a day for going to market, which will be an increase of comfort to them, and render the abolition of the Sunday market a benefit even in a worldly point of view.” To those then who are not thus favoured, it is not “a benefit,” but “an inconvenience;” and in general they are not so favoured.\*

---

being in this country our punishment for great crimes) on the following Saturday afternoon, while those who do attend are exempt from it. This, it must be admitted, is rather a compulsory kind of worship.—How very extraordinary it is that the agents of these estates should feel themselves at liberty thus to *compel* the slaves to attend divine worship, and yet should have been able to discover no means of enforcing the decency of connubial unions among them!

• But, in truth, it is a farce to call the Barbadoes law an abolition of Sunday markets. These now exist, by *law*, from five to nine on Sunday morning. In the newspaper of that island, called the Barbadian, of the 16th December last, is the following editorial paragraph. “We look anxiously for the day when *our* market-house will be closed *the whole* of the Lord's day. When shall we get rid of the trafficking and slaughtering, the noise and uproar, the cursing and swearing, which, from the dawn of day till nine o'clock on Sundays, are so disgusting, and are too disgraceful to be much longer tolerated, we trust, in this Christian land.”—Christian land indeed!

It further appears, that no means have been taken by the Society or its agents, to establish any thing like a Savings' Bank for the slaves, though that also was recommended by the Government. Mr. Clarke indeed, discovers that such is the feeling of distrust entertained by the slaves, that though a single family has *often* been known to receive £20 or £30 for its crop, whatever money it may lay up is *concealed from the knowledge of owners and overseers*," (p. 283.) How then has Mr. Clarke acquired his knowledge of their large earnings? And what encouragement has he given to these poor thralls to place those earnings in safe deposit until they shall accumulate to the value of their redemption, which, in Barbadoes, on the average, does not now exceed £28 sterling? (see Reporter, No. 19, p. 282, &c.) So that, if the statement be true, that families are *often* receiving £20 or £30 for a crop, that is from £14 to £21 sterling, redemptions might be continually occurring.

But, before we close our remarks, we are anxious it should not be supposed that, in making them, we are actuated by any unfriendly feelings towards the venerable Society for propagating the Gospel. If our obligations to the great cause we have undertaken would have permitted us to be silent with respect to its proceedings, we should have felt ourselves relieved from a very painful responsibility. But it would have been actual treason to that cause to have passed so influential an example wholly overlooked. Indeed, having found it to be our duty fearlessly to arraign as *criminal* the principle and whole system of colonial bondage, as well as the conduct of many of those who administer it, it would have laid us justly open to the imputation of moral cowardice, and of the most reprehensible partiality, had we shrunk from a frank and full statement of our views, not only of this Society's proceedings, but of its present attempt to vindicate them. In proportion as its Directors stand high in public estimation and in public confidence, is it important that we should not allow them unwittingly to lend their sanction to principles and practices which we have uniformly denounced, and must continue to denounce, as opposed to the plainest maxims of humanity and justice, and as altogether incompatible with the spirit and the precepts of the Gospel. In the case of private individuals there is at least one palliative plea, however weak it may be in itself, which they may advance. Considerations of self-interest naturally make them averse to reforms, however salutary, which they may think threaten to affect their property. But in the case of the Society there is not even this excuse for maintaining, for a single day, any principle or any practice which Christianity, or even humanity reprobates. We very willingly and gladly admit, that on the Society's estates the oppressions of the system are not so deathful as on most other sugar plantations; though, even here, the progress of population is much slower than among the free blacks and coloured classes in our islands, or among the slaves either in the Bahamas or in the United States. But if the positive physical oppressions, the over-working and the under-feeding, to which the Society's slaves, in common with all around them, were long subjected, have, (as we are happy to believe they have,) diminished in their intensity, so as to admit now of an increase, still we maintain that the Society's slaves continue to indicate the pressure of their bond-



age in the comparative slowness of that increase. But even if this were otherwise; if the Society's slaves increased as fast as the Maroons in Jamaica, or the free blacks in Trinidad, or the slaves in the Bahamas and the United States, still such a result would not deliver this *Christian* Society from the just rebuke of having maintained, for upwards of 120 years, and of still maintaining, a most *unchristian* position. Surely there is something very incongruous and revolting, to say the least, in the contemplation of a Society formed for evangelizing the heathen, which draws a part of its resources from the coerced services of slaves, driven to their labour by the whip and the stocks, and held by it as chattels of sale and of inheritance. Can we imagine the holy evangelist Paul, or the college of Apostles at Jerusalem, defraying the cost of their Asiatic missions, for example, by means of funds drawn from a plantation in Crete, growing corn for the Roman market, and worked by slaves subject to the lash, and who, instead of being treated as the children of the same great Creator, and the fellow-heirs of the same blessings of redemption, were degraded in their civil and social capacities nearly to a level with the beasts that perish? And wherein does the parallel fail, excepting to the disadvantage of a Society existing in our own free and happy land, in this free and more enlightened age? Is it possible for us to raise our voice against the national sin of colonial slavery, and yet forbear from calling on the members of such a Society to wash their hands from its guilt? We should probably, however, have called upon them much less effectually had we failed to expose the true nature of the case, that they may see and feel its whole iniquity. And we would say, in conclusion, that if they have had cause to regret the want of public support, is not this to be in some measure attributed to the existence of this plague spot, which causes many good and conscientious persons to shrink from their counsel and contact? And may not the public approbation, and what is far more important, the Divine favour be more confidently implored, and more certainly anticipated, when they shall have resolved no longer to pursue their present dubious course, but wholly to purge themselves from this foul stain. Thus may they make some reparation for the past, and hold out a signal example of beneficial influence on the future temporal and spiritual destinies of hundreds of thousands of their fellow-creatures.

---

2.—THE WEST INDIA COMMITTEE, AND ITS MERCENARIES OF THE PRESS, PARTICULARLY MR. FRANKLIN, MR. MACQUEEN, &C.

It appears by the Postscript to the Royal Gazette of Jamaica of the 29th November last, that on the 25th of that month a petition had been presented to the House of Assembly on behalf of one James Franklin, formerly of Kingston, in that island, but now of Great Britain, setting forth "That the Petitioner, having had considerable intercourse with St. Domingo or Hayti, was solicited by the West India body in London to publish a faithful description of that country; That the petitioner, under the assurance of receiving from that body the most liberal encouragement and support, did execute such a work; yet the petitioner

has not received the promised support, and is wholly neglected;—That under similar inducements the petitioner was led to prepare and publish a pamphlet entitled ‘A Short View of the West India Question,’ &c., for which the petitioner received the sum of one hundred guineas, which barely covers the expense to which the petitioner was subjected in printing;—That the house will perceive the petitioner has exerted all his powers in aid of the Colonial cause, and of this Island particularly, and hopes that the house, with its usual liberality, will take the petitioner’s case into their consideration, and honour his wife, now in this island, with such remuneration as the house may consider the petitioner entitled to.”

This petition lets us a little into the secret of West Indian publications and proceedings. Mr. Franklin, disappointed in the views which had carried him first to Jamaica and then to St. Domingo, returned to England, and in 1825 and 1826, laboured to form what was called the Haytian Company. And such was the effect of *his* representations, and those of a Mr. Hendrick, concerning the agricultural, commercial, and mining faculties of Hayti, that many highly respectable persons were induced, to their no small eventual loss, to subscribe to this company. Mr. Franklin about the same time made similar representations to Mr. Canning, which (report says) it was expected might have issued in his appointment as Haytian Consul. Both these hopeful projects miscarrying, he was induced, by the solicitations of the West India Committee, and their promises of encouragement and support, to yield them his pen. In a short time he produced an octavo volume, professing to be “a faithful description” of Hayti,\* and also a pamphlet. What these works are few people, we apprehend, can tell, excepting the author himself and his employers, who, indeed, seem not to have valued his labours at any very high rate; and yet, if his publications are to be estimated by the benefit derived from them to “the Colonial cause,” they have been probably overpaid by the hundred guineas awarded to him.

Our readers have probably forgotten that the West India Committee are in the habit of annually levying a tax, (a pro-slavery *rent*.) on all produce imported from slave colonies. Its amount we do not exactly know, but considering the rates of exaction,† we should estimate it at about £20,000 a year. The produce of this *tax*, or *rent*, be it more or less, is placed, as a kind of secret service money, at the sole, uncontrolled and unexplained disposal of the West India Committee. We should like very much to see an account of its appropriation; how much, for example, has gone to electioneering purposes; how much to indemnify libellers; how much to pay for Quarterly and other Reviews;

---

\* We feel some curiosity to compare the letters of Mr. Franklin written to Mr. Canning in 1825 or 1826, with “the faithful description” of Hayti, published under the auspices of the West Indian Committee, in 1827. The purposes of the two, it is true, differed, and this might account for some slight variations. But if Mr. Hume’s motion of last session shall bring the correspondence of Mr. Franklin with the Foreign Office before the public, we shall not be surprised to discover new and strange proofs of descriptive fidelity.

† See for these, “The Slave Colonies of Great Britain,” &c. p. 99, note.

and how much for weekly and daily journals. A great part of this knowledge we shall probably never attain. We have heard, however, of some of their mercenaries having been paid on so much more liberal a scale than Mr. Franklin, that we cannot be surprised at the discontent which that gentleman has manifested. Their present more active partizans (for the Quarterly Review has, of late, confined itself to an occasional growl at Sierra Leone,) appear to be Blackwood, John Bull, the Morning Journal of London, and the Couriers of London and Glasgow. But how many more Journals are kept silent by the influence of the proslavery rent, it may be less easy to ascertain.\* Thus shamefully neglected by the West India Committee, Mr. Franklin has now placed his hope in the *known* liberality of the Members of the Assembly of Jamaica; and without doubt, considering the sums they have lavished on the Rev. Mr. Bridges, Mr. Alexander Barclay, Mr. James Macqueen, &c., he may very fairly make his appeal to their consistency for a large vote of money. He has certainly not done a tenth part of the harm to their cause which has been effected by Mr. Macqueen, to whom the Assembly, in the fervour of its gratitude, voted a sum of 2000 guineas.† We hope they will continue to bestow their bounty on equally deserving objects. In the meantime it is a satisfaction to see that that part of the public press which is most vehemently embarked in the defence of slavery, and most profuse in its abuse of the abolitionists, is also the most vehemently opposed to every measure of liberality, whether commercial or political, as well as the most outrageously abusive of the Duke of Wellington since he has spoken (whether wisely or not, we leave to wiser heads to decide) of giving peace to Ireland.

We cannot help thinking that the West India Committee have behaved rather shabbily to the Noble Duke. After palming upon him the dull romance of Mr. Franklin, as "a faithful description" of Hayti—and the detected impostures of Mr. Barclay, as a just picture of West Indian humanity; they now permit their mercenary journalists to take up the cudgels for Don Miguel, and to revile the Duke himself as a traitor to his king and country.

\* It is a curious fact, that while all the journals of London, and throughout the Kingdom have been filled with details of the Edinburgh horrors, we do not believe that with the exception of a single London morning paper, and two or three other London papers, the slightest notice has been taken of the multiplied horrors which, on Parliamentary authority, the Anti-Slavery Reporters have shown to have taken place, and to be even now proceeding at an enormous rate, in our colonial possessions, and especially in the Mauritius.

† Mr. Macqueen is supposed to have received about £15,000 in all from the West Indies, partly in votes of money by assemblies, and partly in public subscriptions. He has since become the joint proprietor of a large body of slaves, and is now therefore, himself, a great West Indian planter. This circumstance may give a sharper and a louder tone to his vituperations; and it may also render it less necessary for the West Indian body to fee advocates so highly as it has hitherto done. However, if the West Indian Committee should on this account think of economizing their funds, as Mr. Franklin's fate would seem to intimate, a substitute may be found by some at least of that committee's mercenaries in the liberality of the eulogists of Don Miguel, and of the furious revilers of the Duke of Wellington. The Duke will learn ere long, to appreciate both them and their employers.

## 3.—COLONIAL STATISTICS.

IN the Anti-Slavery Reporter, No. 19, will be found an abstract of various statistical returns received from fourteen of our slave colonies. In the last session of Parliament returns were produced from four more, viz. Antigua, Mauritius, Montserrat, and St. Lucia, (Papers of 1st of April, 1828, No. 204.) These we shall now abstract. The colonies which have as yet made no return to the Order of the House of Commons of 6th June, 1825, are Bermuda and the Cape of Good Hope.

## 1. ANTIGUA.

The custom-house of this island furnishes no means of ascertaining the export and import of slaves; unquestionably a great neglect.

The manumissions effected either by purchase or bequest, from the 1st of January, 1821, to the end of 1826, six years, were 956.

The marriages of slaves in the same period were twenty-one, almost all of them by Mr. Curtin, missionary of the Conversion Society. This return, however, is accompanied by a letter from Thomas Lane, the Colonial Secretary, stating, "that there is no existing law in this colony which makes marriages between slaves a civil or religious contract, nor any law to prevent the separation of husband and wife."

There were ten slaves escheated to the Crown, waiting its pleasure.

The number of slaves sold in execution in Antigua, in these six years, was 128. The price for which they were sold was £5774. 16s. currency, being about £45 currency each, or £20. 1s. sterling. In the same period 28 slaves were seized for taxes, and sold for a gross sum of £1031. 12s., being £37 currency, or £16. 15s. sterling each.

In 1821 the free black and coloured population was 1549 males, and 2346 females, in all, 3895. There has been no census since, but the number manumitted as above, without reckoning the increase by births, would raise the number to 4851.

The slave population in 1821 was 14,531 males, 16,533 females, in all, 31,064: in 1824, 14,225 males, 16,089 females, in all, 30,314.

The sums raised for the relief of the poor, in the above six years, amounted to £28,247. 10s. currency, or about £13,450 sterling. But the poor are all white, and it is distinctly stated by Archdeacon Parry, that "there are no free-coloured or black paupers provided for by the parish; nor are the free-coloured or free blacks taxed for the support of the poor. Slaves are supported by their owners." The number of paupers receiving relief is 211 whites.

## 2. MAURITIUS.

The number of slaves imported into the Mauritius from January 1821, to the end of 1826, is stated to have been 1351 males, and 516 females, in all, 1867. This, however, is of course an account of those only who passed regularly through the custom-house, and does not include the vast numbers illicitly imported. The slaves exported in the same period were 299 males, and 248 females, in all, 547.

The number of manumissions, by marriage, from the 1st of January 1821, to the 30th of June 1826, was 245; by bequest or otherwise, 199; in all 444. A tax, amounting to about £25 sterling, appears to have been exacted on most of these manumissions.

By law, the marriage of whites with blacks is severely punishable. If



